

I would have voted in favor of the Jackson-Lee amendment (rollcall No. 23).

I would have voted in favor of the motion to recommit (rollcall No. 24).

I would have voted against passage of H.R. 333, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act (rollcall No. 25).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I was detained due to being with FEMA Director Joe Allbaugh to assess the damage caused by the earthquake in the Puget Sound. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 22, "no" on rollcall No. 23, "no" on rollcall No. 24, and "yea" on rollcall No. 25.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 333.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 333, BANKRUPTCY ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 333, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, citations and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take this time to inquire from the distinguished majority leader and ask him to clarify the schedule for the remainder of the day, the week, and next week.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, March 6 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. No recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Member's offices tomorrow.

On Wednesday, March 7, and Thursday, March 8, the House will consider the following measures: H.R. 624, the Organ Donation Improvement Act of 2001; and H.R. 3, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish all of my colleagues a safe journey home for the weekend and a pleasant weekend with their families and constituents.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I may inquire from the gentleman from Texas, we have been hearing rumors on our side of the aisle that we will be denied an opportunity for a fair and fiscally responsible tax cut substitute when the bill reaches the floor next week. I ask the gentleman from Texas if that is indeed the case.

□ 1500

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman asking that, and it is unfortunate when there are rumors that are upsetting the Members.

The fact of the matter is the rule that governs consideration of that bill will be drafted in the Committee on Rules, and there has been no determination from the committee regarding that. I really cannot, in fact, predict or even suggest what the rule would look like except that it would be, I should think, and we would expect it to be consistent with what the Committee on Rules has done in the past.

Mr. BONIOR. Well, I would say to my friend that that leads me to be even more suspicious of what may transpire next week or in the Committee on Rules.

I just want the gentleman from Texas to know that we would consider it a real breach of bipartisanship. And our reaction to not being able to offer on our side of the aisle, on behalf of 211 Members of Congress that represent quite close to half the population in this country, a substitute that would express our views on how we want to give money back to people, put money in their pockets, if that is not made available to us, I would assure the gentleman from Texas that there will be a very, very negative reaction on this side of the aisle.

I think that the gentleman, per his comments on precedent, can look back

and see that when there were examples of tax bills that came to the floor in the past, in fact when we were in the majority, did make available at various times, and I recall certainly during when President Bush was in the White House, during the late 1980s and early 1990s, we were able to do that for the minority. We expect to have the same kind of courtesy and the same type of response when we come to the floor next week.

We would be sadly and terribly disappointed and angry, if I might say so, if we do not have a chance to voice our view on behalf of 211 Members in our caucus.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there certainly can be no failure on the part of this gentleman to perceive from the manner in which the gentleman from Michigan has just expressed that that would indeed be the case.

But the gentleman from Michigan, having served on the Committee on Rules while in the majority, must certainly be very well aware of the fact that the Committee on Rules does now, as it did then, take its responsibility and its prerogatives seriously. The rule will be written by the Committee on Rules in the Committee on Rules. I am just sorry to say that this gentleman cannot predict what the Committee on Rules will do at that time.

I am sorry that there is a rumor out there, but I have told the gentleman as candidly and straightforwardly as I can that the Committee on Rules has not met on this subject; that I have not discussed the subject of this rule with any member of the Committee on Rules; and I have no basis to project what the Committee on Rules would do except to observe what has been in fact the history of practices with the Committee on Rules with respect to rules of bills of this nature.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, having served for 14 years on the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Rules is an extension of the leadership. It is a leadership committee. And I am sure the gentleman from Texas is not telling me on the floor this afternoon that he has no input into what is going to happen up in the Committee on Rules, because I know, and I think everybody in this institution knows, that the gentleman from Texas and the Speaker and the majority whip, in fact, do have an input, always have had an input on what decision is being made up in the Committee on Rules, especially on such an important issue as a major, major tax bill.

So we expect to be treated with dignity and with fairness, and that means having an opportunity, win or lose, to offer a substitute to what the President and the Republican Party wants to offer.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman's point. I mean the